# SECRES 2004/05/05 : CIA-RDP84B00890R000300030011-2

DD/A Registry
8/-1930

15 SEP 1381

				•	
MEMO RAN	DUM FOR:	Deputy Director of C	entral Intelligenc	ee	
FROM	:	Maurice Lipton Comptroller		Minima Rushins I'd	R'Y
SUBJECT 25X1	:	Maurice Lipton Comptroller  Section 103 of the P Authorization Bill	roposed 1982 Intel	lligents" dega	
			#		
vision titled The pro tical p limit t effect	in the Ho "Notifica posed pro rovision he money for Fisca onse to t	I a decision from you ouse version of the 19 ation of expenditures ovision and sectional was developed by HPSC we could spend without 1981, CIA has the provision, we do need to the provision, we do	82 Intelligence Audin excess of Programalysis are at At I and enacted last t Congress' knowled made no reports to	thorization Bill en- cam Authorization." ttachment A. An iden- tyear (FY 1981) to edge. Although in Congress specifical	- ly
needs t accommo tributi aticall provisi likely, in the	dhering to be reported to be reported to property on is implicated to the control of the control	fice of Finance and ot to the intent of Sectionted include Economy cocurements for other rograms (e.g., CA), no ed to Congress. Even precise and subject to that HPSCI could be norization. We need p	on 103. Possible Act transactions, governments, and in the of which we have congressional state varying interpreteasily pursuaded to olicy guidance on	interpretations of wi proprietary income, foreign government cover we up to now system- ffers agree that the tation. It is not to drop the provision	n-
	Issues e report	. We need your decisiing:	ons as to whether	to attempt to exempt	
	fr 0: b: t: Si	conomy Act Transaction ands for assistance to ther uses are National Y CIA, as well as more ies, such as reimbursatate, and others, where effectively.	the Iranian resco Program activition routine intergoven able services to I	ue mission. es carried out ernmental activi- C Staff, Defense,	
25X1					

25X1

25X1

### Approved For Release 2004/05/06 QDARDP84B00890R000300030011-2

C	o	n
v	•	

- -- The Committee staff will likely oppose this interpretation and press for some reporting on sensitive projects (i.e., toward Option B)
- B. Discuss with Committees and accept reporting of some agreed delineation of the above activities which will assure the Committees that they will be informed of sensitive or potentially controversial activities.

#### Pro

- -- Committees may not settle for less.
- -- Resolving this issue to satisfaction of Committees may make our other relationships easier.

#### Con

- -- Weeding out activities to be reported may be awkward and cumbersome and will likely be judgmental.
- -- Potential conflict with Presidential or Executive prerogative with respect to independent action.
- C. Drop discussion with Congressional staffers on the provision and keep its meaning ambiguous.

#### Pro

- -- Avoids antagonizing Committees on hypothetical questions.
- -- Allows greatest latitude in short run on interpretation of the provision's meaning.

#### Con

-- Leaves us vulnerable to criticism if at any time
Congress believes it should have been informed on a
controversial activity (the Director of Finance believes
we need a basis for ignoring this provision in law).

25X1

IJ	e	C	l.	S	ı	O	IJ	

25X1

A. Push for limited interpretation.

B. Discuss and accept an understanding of some reportable items.

C. Drop discussions.

## Approved For Release 2004/05/05 : CIA-RDF84B00890R000300030011-2

6. The Office of General Counsel also needs your guidance on whether or not to push for a sentence in the statute or conference report which would make clear that, whatever its ultimate configuration, "Section 103 is to be construed consistently with the oversight language in the National Security Act." OMB Staff, in their response to our conference appeal letter, noted a potential risk of reopening debate over the Oversight Act. OGC believes this is unlikely and that language clarifying the relationship between Section 103 and that Act would be useful.
Decision
Pursue such a provision.
Do not pursue such a provision.
Maurice Lipton
Attachments: As Stated
Distribution: Orig - Addressee 1 - DDCI
1 - C/External Affairs Branch 1 - OGC 1 - DDA 1 - ER
1 - Compt Subject 1 - Compt 1 - D/Compt
1 - BMG Chrono O/Compt/BN (15 Sept 81)

25X1 25X1

25X1

25X1

Next 2 Page(s) In Document Exempt

Excerpt from planned appeal on 1982 Authorization Conference (letter recently cleared by OMB)

The House Bill contains, at Section 103, a provision related to notification of expenditures in excess of program authorizations which is not found in the Senate Bill. This provision was first enacted last year as part of the fiscal year 1981 Authorization. Since its enactment, it has become evident that the intent, meaning and effect of this provision are imprecise and unclear. The provision seems to conflict with time-honored and well-understood oversight and review mechanisms related to funding and reprogramming procedures. It may also potentially be in conflict with the oversight language enacted in the fiscal year 1981 Authorization and now contained in Title V of the National Security Act. I understand that our staffs have been working together in an attempt to resolve these problems. I hope that we will be successful in this effort, but if a solution cannot be reached quickly I would urge that the conferees delete Section 103 so that we can continue with consultations aimed at agreement on mutually acceptable and understandable procedures if, indeed, current practices are not adequate.